

Appl. No. 09/832,980  
Amdt. dated May 4, 2005  
Reply to Office action of February 4, 2005  
Atty. Docket No. AP1103US

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the examiner made "Final" the restriction requirement as a result of which claims 6 to 10 and 14 to 18 were withdrawn from consideration, although it is noted that the examiner did not explicitly say so. Consequently, the foregoing amendment cancels claims 6 to 10 and 14 to 18, without prejudice; the applicant retains the right to present these claims in a divisional application.

Claims 1, 2 and 3 have been cancelled and replaced by new claims 19, 21 and 23, respectively. Corresponding method claims 11, 12 and 13 have been cancelled and replaced by new claims 29, 31 and 33, respectively.

Claims 4 and 5 have been made dependent upon new claim 19.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the examiner rejected original claims 1 to 3 and 11 to 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by the disclosure of US 6,212,259 (Kiko). It is submitted that the rejection was without proper foundation but may have resulted from a lack of clarity in the wording of those claims. New claims 19, 21 and 23 make it clear that the termination circuit cancels far end echo using return loss circuits having filters to restrict the return loss signals to the desired bands, i.e., the voice band in the case of claim 19; the data band in the case of claim 21; both in the case of claim 23. These new claims also specify clearly that the return loss signals are combined with the outgoing voice and data signals.

Kiko does not disclose such a termination circuit which provides for far end echo problems by filtering the return loss signals to restrict them to a desired band. Kiko was concerned with impedance values changing when a telephone set changes state, i.e., goes "on-hook" or "off-hook". (Col. 2, lines 11 to 16) and addressed the problem by means of an impedance blocking filter (Col. 2, lines 17 to 26). Kiko's Figures 8 and 12, cited specifically by the examiner, disclose alternative embodiments of such impedance blocking filters for connection to each telephone set. Kiko does mention that "Optionally, a return loss correction circuit .... may be interconnected between the common points A,B and the output terminals 70,72" of his impedance blocking filter 59d of Figure 12, but does not mention limiting the return loss signals to either voice band or data band. This is hardly surprising since Kiko's return loss correction circuits TC1, TC2 would be located between the impedance blocking filter 59d and the jack 60 for the telephone set and so would be isolated from the data signals.

Claims 20, 22 and 24, dependent upon claims 19, 21 and 23, respectively, introduce the transhybrid loss and near end echo cancellation circuitry which, previously, was the subject of independent claim 6 (withdrawn following the restriction requirement). The examiner erred in reading original claim 6 onto Kiko's disclosure, in particular by selecting elements of the filter of

Appl. No. 09/832,980  
Amdt. dated May 4, 2005  
Reply to Office action of February 4, 2005  
Atty. Docket No. API103US

Kiko's Figure 8 and elements of the filter of Figure 12 and combining them. Kiko does not disclose a termination circuit as claimed in applicant's claims 20, 22 and 24 having both far end echo cancellation restricted to a specific band (voice/data) as per claims 1 and 2 in combination with transhybrid loss/near end echo cancellation.

New claims 25, 26 and 25 are dependent upon new claim 20 and recite specific features of the circuit relating to further processing of the incoming signal after it has had transhybrid loss/near end echo cancelled, specifically to facilitate analog-to-digital conversion. These features previously were recited in (withdrawn) claims 7 to 10 and 15 to 18.

The new method claims correspond to the new termination circuit claims so similar considerations apply to them.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all claims of record are patentable over the cited references and early and favourable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

4<sup>th</sup> May 05  
Date

Thomas Adams  
Thomas Adams, Reg. No. 31,078

Adams Patent and Trademark Agency  
Box 11100, Station H  
Ottawa, Ontario  
Canada K2H 7T8  
Tel: (613) 254 9111  
Fax: (613) 254 9222